join, some of them think that they will continue to be protected in their present position at the cost of the British. Among fifty-four members of the League of Nations, forty-five nations were republics and only nine had limited monarchies like that of England, yet within India, 561 princes and princelings expect to be maintained as absolute despots. Like so many Canutes, they hope to use British Imperialism to hold back the rising tide of democracy or even Socialism, but the present position of Britain in the world is such as to make concessions to Indian opinion and to the Congress inevitable, as is already clear. India must be kept friendly; her weakness and unarmed condition is a danger opposite a predatory Japan. What will be the position of the Princes, if power passes to a National Government in British India? They may find themselves prisoners in their insolvent palaces!

At this stage it may be well to say something of the attitude of the Congress to the states. It has been somewhat ambiguous. When the All-India Congress Committee in Calcutta in October, 1937, passed a resolution protesting against repression in Mysore State and called for support and encouragement to the people of the state in their "non-violent struggle,[55] it produced a vehement protest from Mr. Gandhi. He referred to a previous resolution of non-interference in the affairs of the states and said that the resolution was *ultra vires.* This brought up three important questions:

(i) Would the Congress agree to the initiation of civil disobedience in the" states? (2) If the states people initiated such a movement, would the Congress countenance it and give it friendly support? (3) Or would the Congress under no circumstances support such a movement under Congress auspices? The resolution of the Working Committee which was